United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

. APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/613,434	07/03/2003	Aleksandar Milosavljevic	GMX 071394	4478	
Robert D. Tous	7590 11/15/2007		EXAM	INER	
GMX Technology Inc. 29 Golden Eagle Lane Littleton, CO 80127			DEJONG, ERIC S		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
<u> </u>			1631		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/15/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/613,434	MILOSAVLJEVIC ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Eric S. DeJong	1631		

	CAUTITIO	7.11.01.11.0				
	Eric S. DeJong	1631				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 23 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or		E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN			
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the appropria	te extension fee			
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex	tension and the corresponding amount	of the fee. The appropr	iate extension fee			
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late						
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)		te of the illiantejection,	even ii timely illed,			
NOTICE OF APPEAL						
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since			
AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause			
(a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•	i E below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be		ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially re	adding or antipmying	1110 100000 101			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: see continuation sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.11	6 and 41.33(a)).					
4. $oxedsymbol{oxed}$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	☑ will not be entered or b) ☐ wi	Il he entered and an	volunation of			
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro		ii be cillered and all t	explanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	· ·					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 61-73 and 75-80.						
Claim(s) rejected. <u>67-75 and 75-56.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	Is to provide a			
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	•		•			
TO. [] The anidavit of other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	or the status of the claims after e	inty is below of attact	icu.			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by see continuation sheet. 		n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13.		NOT.				
		EDTIONIZE	T.			
		EDJ ,				
		/Marjorie A. Morani SPF_AU 1631	•			

Continuation of Item 3, NOTE:

Applicants proposed after Final amendment, filed 10/23/2007, contains amendments to the instant claims that, if entered, would necessitate new grounds of rejection. Specifically, proposed claim 61 has been amended to recite "samples stored on DNA-immobilizing paper" in lines 4 and 5 of said claim. However, lines 12 and 13 of said claim further recites "said sample on fibrous DNA-immobilizing media", which lacks antecedent basis in the claim and would be rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph. Therefore, applicants proposed after Final amendment will not be entered.

Continuation of Item 11. NOTE

The rejection of claims set forth in the Office action mailed 08/08/2007 are maintained for reasons of record.

The rejection of claims 61-73 and 75-80 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants arguments are directed to proposed after Final amendments that have not been entered, and are therefore not persuasive in regard to the claims of record, filed 05/16/2007. It is further noted that proposed claim 61 still recites the limitation "fibrous DNA immobilizing media" in lines 12 and 13 and is therefore not limited to "DNA immobilizing paper".

The rejection of claims 61-73 and 75-80 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hodge (US Patent No. 6,977,178) in view of Burgoyne (US Patent No. 5,807,527).

Applicants arguments are directed to proposed after Final amendments that have not been entered, and are therefore not persuasive in regard to the claims of record, filed 05/16/2007.